

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this amendment, claims 1-18 and 20-24 remain pending, claims 1, 8, 16 and 21 having been amended.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 14-18 and 21-24

On page 2 of the Final Office Action of August 7, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 14-18 and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,789,060 to Wolfe et al. (“Wolfe”) in view of published U.S. Patent Application 2006/0020673A1 to Sorge et al. (“Sorge”). Applicants submit that the amended claims obviate the rejection.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a method for processing voicemail messages. The method includes, among other things, transcribing a plurality of voicemail messages, only after storing a predetermined number of the plurality of voicemail messages for a certain user, to produce a plurality of voicemail message transcripts, and indexing the plurality of voicemail message transcripts, wherein each word in the plurality of voicemail message transcripts is indexed relative to an occurrence of a corresponding word in the plurality of voicemail messages.

On page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Wolfe discloses or suggests indexing the plurality of voicemail message transcripts according to their current status and selectable subdirectories. However, Applicants submit that Wolfe does not disclose or suggest indexing a plurality of voicemail message transcripts, wherein each word in the plurality of voicemail message transcripts is indexed relative to an occurrence of a corresponding word in the plurality of voicemail messages, as required by amended claim 1. Further, Wolfe fails to disclose or suggest transcribing a plurality of voicemail messages,

only after storing a predetermined number of the plurality of voicemail messages for a certain user, to produce a plurality of voicemail message transcripts, as required by amended claim 1.

Sorge fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Wolfe. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Wolfe nor Sorge disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination, transcribing a plurality of voicemail messages, only after storing a predetermined number of the plurality of voicemail messages for a certain user, to produce a plurality of voicemail message transcripts, and indexing the plurality of voicemail message transcripts, wherein each word in the plurality of voicemail message transcripts is indexed relative to an occurrence of a corresponding word in the plurality of voicemail messages, as required by amended claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 6 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Wolfe in view of Sorge for at least reasons the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3 and 6 be withdrawn.

Amended claims 8, 16 and 21 recite features similar to the previously-discussed features of claim 1 and are patentable over Wolfe in view of Sorge for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended claims 8, 16 and 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 9-11, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 22-24 depend from one of claims 8, 16 and 21 and are patentable over Wolfe in view of Sorge for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 8, 16 and 21. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 9-11, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 22-24 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2, 5 and 20

On page 6 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 5 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wolfe in view of Sorge and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,041 to Reynar et al. (“Reynar”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,775,360 to Davidson et al. (“Davidson”). Applicants submit that amended claims 1 and 16 obviate the rejection.

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1, which is patentable over Wolfe in view of Sorge for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Reynar and Davidson fail to satisfy all of the deficiencies of Wolfe and Sorge. For example, Reynar and Davidson fail to disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination with Wolfe and Sorge, transcribing a plurality of voicemail messages, only after storing a predetermined number of the plurality of voicemail messages for a certain user, to produce a plurality of voicemail message transcripts, as required by amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2 and 5 be withdrawn.

Claim 20 depends from amended independent claim 16, which recites features similar to those of claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 20 is patentable over Wolfe in view of Sorge and further in view of Reynar and Davidson for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 2 and 5. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 4, 7, 12 and 13

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 7, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wolfe in view of Sorge and further in view of Davidson. Applicants submit that amended claims 1 and 8 obviate the rejection.

Claims 4 and 7 depend from amended claim 1, which is patentable over Wolfe in view of Sorge for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Davidson

fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Wolfe and Sorge. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4 and 7 be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 8, which is patentable over Wolfe in view of Sorge for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 8. As mentioned above, Davidson also fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Wolfe and Sorge. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 12 and 13 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 6, 2006

By: Richard C. Irving

Correspondence Address:
Thomas A. Restaino
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433